

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,161	08/29/2001	David Glazer	1050390-991111	6819

7590 05/19/2004

Eric Hoover  
Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich  
1755 Embarcadero Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/942,161

Applicant(s)

GLAZER ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 8/29/2001.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claims 1-8 are pending in the case. Claims 1, and 6 are independent claims.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed on 2/27/2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

#### ***Priority***

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), and based on U.S provisional application # 60/228,853 filed on 8/29/2000, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### ***Drawings***

5. The drawings filed on 8/29/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al, hereinafter Ludwig (Pat.# 5,689,641, 11/18/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share information using real-time—*streaming rich media presentation*-- video, audio, etc., in such as way as to imitate face to face collaboration meetings (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64).

Moreover Ludwig discloses the storage and recording of multimedia teleconferences—*storing rich media presentation*--, which include all audio/video participant interactions, for later playback (col.3, lines 6-64).

In addition, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share snapshots of screen regions, running applications, and information using real-time video, audio—*dynamic objects*--, etc., in such as way as to imitate face to face collaboration meetings . Users are able to setup, accept, refuse—*retrieve and view*-- teleconferencing sessions with other participants, in order to initiate the collaborative sessions and share multimedia information on each other's screen (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.21, line 6-col.22, line 67).

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share snapshots of screen regions, running applications, and information in each other's screens using real-time video, audio—*dynamic objects*-- etc.. Thereby, allowing the participants to simultaneously display theirs, and other participants' screens locally—*linking the rich media presentation with one or more dynamic objects* (screens) displayed simultaneously shared among the participants (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67).

Moreover, Ludwig discloses that once the snapshots have been displayed on the participants' screens, the participants can annotate those screen shots using software modules—*editing tool*-- (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67, col.34, lines 57-67).

Furthermore, Ludwig teaches mechanism supporting the intra-file search capability to allow a user to search through and navigate stored multimedia information or documents—*search dynamic objects* (col.31, lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Ludwig discloses the participants can annotate the screen shots once the snapshots have been displayed on the participants' screens (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67, fig. 2B).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Ludwig teaches setting up videoconference calls, by allowing a user(s) to place a call—*poll the group of participants*-- to other users or participants for adding those participants to the video conference meeting. The called participants can in turn accept or refuse the call (col. 2, lines 45-67, and col. 22, lines 10-67).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Ludwig teaches the reviewing and searching—*full text searching*-- multimedia documents, such as an email log (col. 2, lines 45-67, and col. 22, lines 10-67, col. 41, lines 1-37).

Regarding independent claim 6, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share information using real-time—*streaming rich media presentation*-- video, audio, etc., in such as way as to imitate face to face collaboration meetings (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64).

Moreover Ludwig discloses the storage and recording of multimedia teleconferences—*storing rich media presentation*--, which include all audio/video participant interactions, for later playback (col.3, lines 6-64).

In addition, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share snapshots of screen regions, running applications, and information using real-time video, audio—*dynamic objects*--, etc., in such as way as to imitate face to face collaboration meetings . Users are able to setup, accept, refuse—*retrieve and view*-- teleconferencing sessions with other participants, in order to initiate the collaborative sessions and share multimedia information on each other's screen (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.21, line 6-col.22, line 67).

Moreover, Ludwig discloses a multimedia system for enabling participants to share snapshots of screen regions, running applications, and information in each other's screens using real-time video, audio—*dynamic objects*-- etc.. Thereby, allowing the participants to simultaneously display theirs, and other participants' screens locally—*associating the rich media*

Art Unit: 2178

*presentation with one or more dynamic objects* (screens) displayed simultaneously shared among the participants (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67).

Moreover, Ludwig discloses that once the snapshots have been displayed on the participants' screens, the participants can annotate those screen shots using software modules—*editing means to modify the dynamic objects--* (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67, col.34, lines 57-67).

Furthermore, Ludwig teaches mechanism supporting the intra-file search capability to allow a user to search through and navigate stored multimedia information or documents—*search the dynamic objects* (col.31, lines 40-67).

Claims 7-8 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 2-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig, in view of Plantz et al, hereinafter Plantz (Pat. # 6,088,702, 7/11/2000, filed on 2/25/1998).



Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Ludwig discloses that once the snapshots have been displayed on the participants' screens, the participants can annotate those screen shots using software modules—*editing means to modify the dynamic objects*-- (col.2, lines 56-col.3, line 64, col.26, lines 27-67, col.34, lines 57-67). Ludwig fails to explicitly teach *the editing tool includes a security feature ...such that a participant must enter a permission code before being able to modify a secured object*. However, Plantz teaches permitting a user to edit multimedia documents only by providing a username and password (col.7, lines 27-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ludwig, and Plantz, because Plantz teaches above the benefit of preventing unauthorized access to the documents. In other words, unauthorized users would be prevented from altering the multimedia documents of Ludwig.

### ***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Smith (Pat. # 5,640,560), Boezeman et al. (Pat. # 6,263,486), Gupta et al. (Pat. # 6,546,405), Ferrel et al. (Pat. # 6,584,480), Mattaway (Pat. # 6,728,784), and Ludwig et al. (Pat. # 2002/0154210).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

Art Unit: 2178

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents


P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



CESAR B PAULA

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2178

5/17/04